

UTAH RADIATION CONTROL BOARD

**MINUTES OF THE UTAH RADIATION CONTROL BOARD MEETING, April 5, 2002,
Department of Environmental Quality (Bldg #2), 168 North 1950 West, Conf. Room 101,
Salt Lake City, Utah.**

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Stephen T. Nelson, Ph.D., Chairman
William J. Sinclair, M.S.E.H., Executive Secretary
Kent J. Bradford, P.G.
Thomas K. Chism, M.S.
Cathleen C. Gilbert, C.P.A., Esq.
Teryl J. Hunsaker, Commissioner
Karen S. Langley, M.S.
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.
Gregory G. Oman, D.D.S., B.S.
Barbara S. Reid, M.D.

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT/EXCUSED

Gary L. Edwards, M.S., Vice Chairman
Rod O. Julander, Ph.D.

DRC STAFF/OTHER DEQ MEMBERS PRESENT

Clark Clements, DRC Staff
Dane Finerfrock, DRC Staff
Gwyn Galloway, DRC Staff
John Hultquist, DRC Staff
Boyd Imai, DRC Staff
Laura Lockhart, DEQ/Attorney General's Office
Chris Morley, DEQ/Attorney General's Office
Loren Morton, DRC Staff
Fred Nelson, DEQ/Attorney General's Office
Yoli Shropshire, DRC Staff

PUBLIC

Kenneth L. Alkema, Envirocare of Utah, Inc.
Robert Baird
Claire Geddes, Utah Legislative Watch
Jason Groenewold, FAIR
Jim Holtkamp, LeBoeuf, Lamb, Greene
& MaCrae LLP

Mark Ledoux, Envirocare of Utah, Inc.
Michelle Rehmann, IUC (USA)
Robert E. Rampton, W.S. Adamson &
Associates
Rachel White, FAIR

Cindy King, Utah Chapter of the Sierra Club

GREETINGS/MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

The Utah Radiation Control Board convened in the DEQ Building #2, Room 101, 168 North 1950 West, in Salt Lake City, Utah. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. by Dr. Stephen T. Nelson, Chairman of the Board. Dr. Nelson welcomed all members and public attending the meeting. Dr. Nelson stated to those present, if they wished to address any items on the agenda to indicate it on the sheet as they signed in. Those desiring to comment would be given a chance to address their concerns on any agenda items to the Board.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Approval of March 1, 2002 Minutes (Board action item)

Stephen Nelson, Chairman, asked if there were any needed corrections or clarifications to the March minutes. Dianne Nielson stated that if anybody believed that the hearing record transcript does not accurately reflect something that was said, Board members can submit corrections for the record. This will not change the hearing transcript but only ensure that comments were accurately recorded.

Greg Oman made a motion to approve the minutes of March 1, 2002, seconded by Teryl Hunsaker.

CARRIED AND APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

II. RULES

a. Charges to R313-17-2(1)(a), R313-22-33(e), R313-70-7(2)(d)(e)(f), and new R313-24, Uranium Mills and Uranium Mill Tailings Disposal Facility Requirements - to public comment (Board action item)

Bill Sinclair reported that the supplemental packet contained a copy of the proposed uranium recovery rulemaking that the Division wishes to move forward to public comment. This rulemaking is necessary for the Division to pursue an amended Agreement from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to regulate uranium mills and tailings. Included in the Board packet were the following:

- (1) Changes to R313-17-2(1)(a) - Uranium recovery categories 2d, 2e, and 2f were added to the public notice requirements
- (2) Changes to R313-70-7-2 - License Categories were modified to include uranium recovery facilities (categories 2d, 2e, and 2f)
- (3) Change to R313-22-33, General Requirements for Specific Licenses, was modified to include a provision under (e) to ensure consistency by addressing R313-24.
- (4) Adoption by reference of appropriate parts of 10 CFR Part 40 was done. Also included in the packet was the appropriate information from NRC Compatibility Guidance, SA-200 which defines compatibility categories for State rulemaking. In

terms of the rulemaking, all sections of 10 CFR Part 40 that had compatibility categories A, B, and C were adopted. Generally, category D compatibility items are reserved for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and will not be adopted. However, all D compatibility items relating to health and safety were reviewed to ensure that there was coverage elsewhere in the Utah Radiation Control Rules. Preparation of the rulemaking for filing with the Division of Administrative Rules followed this concept.

(5) Since the State of Utah has no comparable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Environmental Impact or Assessment process, a new section, R313-24-7 was added to require an environmental report to be submitted which will address the issues to be considered during a major license modification or new license decision process.

Bill Sinclair emphasized that it was important that this rulemaking move forward at this time. This action would allow the rulemaking to be completed at the June 7, 2002, Board meeting such that the Division might be able to file the final application with the NRC on or before June 15, 2002. This will provide the best opportunity for the Division to assume responsibility in this area on or before March 30, 2002. If the schedule is compromised, the next available date for the Division to assume responsibility may be October 1, 2003.

Teryl Hunsaker made a motion that the rule go out for public comment, seconded by Karen Langley.

CARRIED AND APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

III. RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS LICENSING/INSPECTION

No items

IV. X-RAY REGISTRATION/INSPECTION

a. Mammography Imaging Medical Physicist application consideration - James A. Tomlinson (Board action item)

Gwyn Galloway indicated to Board members that enclosed in the packet was an application needing approval as a Mammography Imaging Medical Physicist from James A. Tomlinson. DRC staff has reviewed the application and recommended that Mr. Tomlinson be approved as a Mammography Imaging Medical Physicist from the period of April 5, 2002 - June 6, 2003.

Barbara Reid made a motion that James A. Tomlinson be approved as a Mammography Imaging Medical Physicist for the period of April 5, 2002 - June 6, 2003, seconded by Tom Chism.

CARRIED AND APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

V. RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL

a. Summary of Low-Level Waste Forum Meeting, Charleston, S.C., March 10-12, 2002 (Board information item)

Bill Sinclair reported on his attendance at the recent Low-Level Waste Forum meeting held in Charleston, South Carolina, March 10-12, 2002. Bill indicated that the initial presentation centered on a proposed study by the National Academy of Sciences regarding radioactive waste (which was discussed later in the Board meeting). During the first day of the meeting, information was exchanged regarding the recent NRC entombment option which is being examined as a tool for long-term decay in storage as part of the decommissioning of a reactor. It was published as an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking by the NRC on October 16, 2001. After taking comment, three options seem the most viable: (1) do nothing, (2) change the existing regulations to accommodate this idea, and (3) promulgate a new Part for entombment.

There was also information presented that the state of Maine is now in the process of withdrawing from the new Texas Compact (of Maine, Vermont, and Texas) due to the lack of progress of siting a new facility in Texas and the availability of disposal of Maine waste at the Envirocare facility. Bill indicated that both the Barnwell and Envirocare sites were discussed in detail regarding recent activities. Bill presented information regarding the appeals process now ongoing by the Board to Forum members. A representative of the Environmental Protection Agency presented information on EPA's final rule on the treatment, transportation, and disposal of mixed waste. Forum members were also provided with an informative presentation on security at nuclear power plants by the Nuclear Energy Institute. The meeting concluded with a presentation and update on the Army Corps of Engineer's FUSRAP program.

b. Amended Order to Modify Operating Procedures and License - Envirocare of Utah, Inc., March 4, 2002 (Board information item)

Bill Sinclair stated that within the Board packet was an Amended Order to Modify Operating Procedures and License issued to Envirocare of Utah, Inc., on March 4, 2002. This order is the result of a series of events involving contaminated tools that were stolen from Envirocare's restricted area and later pawned at a local Tooele County pawn shop by an employee of Envirocare's contractor. Envirocare notified the Division of the potential problem which allowed DRC to launch an extensive investigation into this incident. The order stipulated that Envirocare "mark" their own tools (to distinguish them from waste tools), beef up site surveillance and security, and require generators to segregate tools where possible into closed containers, and notify all generators of the new procedures.

Bill mentioned that the Division had undertaken an extensive investigation and will meet shortly with Envirocare to release the results of that investigation. The Division also conducted "survey days" at the Tooele County Health Department to afford citizens the opportunity to have tools checked that may have been purchased from the pawn shop without them realizing a contamination problem existed. None of the tools surveyed were found to be contaminated. A home was also surveyed by the Division to check for potential contamination. The Division worked closely with Tooele County in this regard.

c. National Academy of Sciences Study (NAS): Improving Practices for Regulating and Management of Low-Level Radioactive Waste (Board information item)

As Bill had mentioned previously, there has been a NAS study proposed regarding low-level radioactive waste. Within the packet is a description of the proposed study and a request for funding. It appears that the study will be extensive and will center on three things:

1. Using available information, the study will summarize the sources, forms, quantities, hazards, and other identifying characteristics of low-level activity waste in the United States;
2. Conduct a review and summarize current policies and procedures for regulating, treating, and disposal of waste, including the risk basis and identify waste streams that are not being regulated or managed in a safe and cost-effective manner; and
3. Provide an assessment of technical and policy options for improving waste management practices.

The suggested contribution level for the funding request was \$25,000. Funding has already been obtained from the NRC, EPA, and Army Corps of Engineers.

Bill described a letter in the supplemental packet that provided the state's perspective that such a study was both necessary and beneficial. However, Bill declined to obligate any state monies to the project. Bill did invite the Academy to come to Utah, view firsthand some of the issues, and talk to site operators and their staffs and appropriate state regulatory personnel.

After some discussion, a motion was made by Kent Bradford that Bill Sinclair draft a letter and sent an invitation to NAS on behalf of the Board to hold an information gathering meeting in Utah if the study proceeds, seconded by Teryl Hunsaker.

CARRIED AND APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

d. Determination regarding written findings on motion by FAIR to intervene regarding appeals of final Executive Secretary decision on Envirocare's modification request to accept containerized Class A waste in the existing cell of November 19, 2001 - presentation by Fred Nelson, Utah Attorney General's Office (Board action item)

Fred indicated that at the last Board meeting the Board made two decisions, one with respect to the motion for summary judgement and the other with respect to the petition to intervene on Containerized Class A low-level radioactive waste. Fred indicated that the parties are still working on a decision document on the motion for summary judgement. This document is not ready at this time and it is anticipated that it would be on the June 2002 meeting agenda.

Fred continued by stating that, regarding the Containerized A waste decision, the Board denied the request to intervene. A draft decision document was prepared and all parties were requested to send comments to the Attorney General's Office by March 22, 2002. Fred indicated no comments were received. As a result, the draft Containerized A decision document on the petition to intervene was provided to the Executive Secretary for placement in the Board packet so the Board would have an opportunity to review the document. Fred stated that during the afternoon on April 4, 2002, he received a fax of a letter from Jason Groenewold, representing FAIR, indicating that he had three concerns with the revised draft. Fred said that copies were made and handed out to Board Members as they came into the

meeting. Fred indicated that his recommendation to the Board was that the document be approved for signature as submitted in the packet. Fred said that it may be appropriate to have Mr. Groenewold present whatever comments he wanted to the Board and that the Board could discuss those issues.

Jason Groenewold asked for the following changes to be made to the draft document presented to the Board by Fred Nelson as follows:

(1) On page two, first paragraph, last two sentences, which read: “The Executive Secretary and Envirocare were allowed until January 18, 2002, to submit a response to the intervention request. Any reply by FAIR was to be filed by February 18, 2002.” Change to read: “The Executive Secretary and Envirocare were allowed until January 18, 2002, to submit a response to the intervention request. Any reply by FAIR was to be filed by February 18, 2002, **however February 18, 2002, was a State holiday.**” Jason said that, as the draft copy of the letter is read further, another paragraph of the draft suggested that FAIR was late on their response, and the reason for this was because February 18, 2002, was Martin Luther King Jr.’s birthday. Jason asked once again if the language could be change to read, “ . . . **however, February 18, 2002, was a State holiday.**”

(2) On page 5, second sentence, which reads: “Also, the Board notes that FAIR has not raised any concerns with respect to the fact that Envirocare has been receiving containerized class A low-level radioactive waste since the license was issued over four months ago.” Jason requested that the entire sentence be stricken. Jason said that the whole basis for the appeal was to put forward the concerns that FAIR did have.

(3) On page 5, last sentence of the first paragraph which reads: “The Board concludes that FAIR has not raised issues of significant public importance that would warrant granting standing in this proceeding.” Change to read, “**While the Board knows that FAIR is the only entity that appealed the license amendment, it concludes that FAIR has not raised issues of significance public importance . .**”

There was discussion among Board members, Fred Nelson, and Jason Groenewold concerning the changes to the draft. The discussion centered on certain language within the draft and whether it accurately reflected the position of the Board.

Teryl Hunsaker, made a motion that the Board accept the decision on the petition to intervene regarding Containerized Class A low-level radioactive waste as written, seconded by Karen Langley.

Stephen Nelson asked that a roll call vote be done. He indicated that a “yes” vote would be in favor of approving the document as is. The voting was as follows:

Karen Langley - Yes
Greg Oman - Yes
Cathleen Gilbert - Abstain, because she was not present at last Board meeting.
Stephen Nelson - Abstain
Dianne R. Nielson - Yes
Barbara Reid - Yes
Kent Bradford - Yes
Tom Chism - Yes
Teryl Hunsaker - Yes

CARRIED AND PASSED BY A VOTE OF 7-0 WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS

b. Determination of hearing schedule for remaining issue regarding appeals of final Executive Secretary decision on Envirocare's application to accept containerized Class A, B, and C low-level radioactive waste of July 9, 2001 - presentation by Laura Lockhart, Attorney General's Office (Board action item)

Laura Lockhart of the Utah Attorney General's Office indicated to the Board that the parties had reached consensus on one item in the Envirocare case, which was currently before the Board as an action item. Laura indicated that the Board had been provided with a joint motion for Order Regarding Procedures and Schedule Governing Consideration of Families Against Incinerator Risk's Request for Agency Action.

Laura indicated that the Order specifies that the discovery period for parties began April 5, 2002 and concludes on August 30, 2002. FAIR must file a witness list by June 14, 2002 identifying its expected fact and expert witnesses and a "Witness Summary" for each witness within their control. The Witness Summary is required to contain a concise summary of the expected direct testimony of the witness, including reference to all facts and documents on which the witness relies. Envirocare and the Executive Secretary must file their witness list and summaries by June 26, 2002. Expert witness reports are due by August 1, 2001. The Order identifies procedures for amendments to the witness list. All parties have the right to depose any and all witnesses designated by the other party, as well as up to five individuals not named on a witness list. Parties are required to file the following pre-hearing submissions by October 1, 2002:

- (1) Pre-filed testimony for all witnesses within the party's control;
- (2) A pre-hearing brief, limited to 25 pages, not including exhibits, and;
- (3) Proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law.

Laura indicated that they needed two issues resolved by the Board:

- (1) Approval of the proposed order, and
- (2) a determination of the hearing schedule for the remaining issues in regards to the appeals of the final Executive Secretary decision on Envirocare's application to accept containerized Class A, B, and C low-level radioactive waste of July 9, 2001.

Recommended hearing date:

(a) October 21, 2002 or as soon as possible.

Questions by Board members:

Kent Bradford asked if the hearing would occur as an agenda item at a regular meeting or would it be a special meeting. Laura Lockhart responded that the parties have preferred to have it outside of a regular Board meeting. Laura indicated that the hearing will probably last for the best part of the day and stated that it would make sense to separate it from the meeting. Responding to a question from Teryl Hunsaker, Laura indicated that all parties are in agreement with the Order.

Teryl Hunsaker moved that the Order be accepted as written, seconded by Greg Oman.

Dianne Nielson asked if the Order actually establishes the hearing date as October 21, 2002. Laura Lockhart responded that the Order establishes October 21, 2002 as the first date that it would be possible, or as soon thereafter as possible.

Kent Bradford asked since there have been some delays already in the appeals process, what would happen if one of the days stipulated in the Order was reached and one of the parties claimed they were not ready for one reason or the other.

Laura Lockhart responded that she believes that this is the advantage of having the Order. It will hopefully reduce the possibility of further delays. If that does happen, a party in default must come to the Board requesting an extension of time for good cause. The Board will have to decide, at that time, whether there is sufficient good cause.

Barbara Reid indicated that she and others would be leaving the Board before this is concluded. She asked Fred Nelson if this will make a difference. Fred Nelson responded that the replacement member would be responsible for making a decision regarding the appeal.

Kent Bradford asked Fred if there is a potential form of delay in bringing new members up to speed on all of this. Fred Nelson responded that there should not be a delay. The same record will be reviewed by all Board members including the pre- filed testimony and briefs. All Board members will be getting the record for review at the same time before the hearing. Laura Lockhart added that if one examines the Order, plenty of background is provided and new Board members that have not been as familiar with the case may have to spend more time than the rest in preparation. Laura indicated that she believed that all the parties intend it to be a quick review. Kent Bradford then commented that it would not be a piece by piece put together, but it will be a complete packet at some point. Laura Lockhart responded that was correct.

Stephen Nelson called for a vote by Board Members on the motion:

Karen Langley - Yes

Greg Oman - Yes

Cathleen Gilbert - Yes
Stephen Nelson - Yes
Dianne Nielson - Yes
Barbara Reid - Yes
Kent Bradford - Yes
Tom Chism - Yes
Teryl Hunsaker - Yes

CARRIED AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

VI. URANIUM MILL TAILINGS UPDATE (Board information items)

- a. Summary of Moab Millsite Stakeholder's Meeting, Moab, Utah of March 15, 2002**
- b. Summary of Moab Millsite Stakeholder's Relocation Subcommittee, Moab, Utah, March 25, 2002 and announcement of upcoming meeting of May 1, 2002, Moab, Utah**
- c. Upcoming meeting of Moab Millsite Stakeholder's Groundwater Subcommittee, April 16, 2002, 8:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m., Department of Energy Grand Junction Office, Grand Junction, Colorado**

Loren Morton, DRC Staff reporting on the above activities to the Board. The activities which took place are summarized in the following table:

Uranium Mill Tailings Activities: Since 03/01/02

Date	Activity / Description
------	------------------------

Moab Millsite Activities

<p>March 15, 2002</p>	<p>Atlas Stakeholder's Meeting, Moab, Utah</p> <p>1. DOE Update on Atlas Site Status (Ray Plienness, DOE-GJO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chemical inventory done (Atlas lab) Soil berm constructed at used oil storage (~ 20 drums) Dust control strategy in place Rad survey of pile cover materials completed. Floodplain (100 yr) & wetlands delineated NH₃ water quality study completed in GW sandbar areas. 0.5 acre HDPE lined pond (single FML) installed on top of pile Things to do thru 9/30/02: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement Initial GW Action (backwater flushing) Develop site waste management plan Design Interim GW Action (pump & treat) Collect more data for final DOE Remediation Plan <p>2. Future Role of Stakeholder's Group (DEQ, DOE-GJO, and Grand Co.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Number of meetings per year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As needed – next meeting before September, 2002. b. Discussion on how to involve local citizens <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Relocation Subcommittee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bill Hedden – GCT (Chairman) Rep. Max Young Harvey Merrell (former Grand Co. councilman) UDOT district engineer BLM DOE-GJO NPS DEQ (DRC & DERR) c. Examine/re-align number of local, state, and federal agencies involved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < see 2b, above. <p>3. Groundwater Subcommittee Report on 10/17/01 Meeting in Grand Junction (Dan Kimball, NPS / Loren Morton, UDEQ)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DRC report on this meeting has been provided the RC Board previously. <p>4. DOE Process for Proposals for Remediation (information item) (Donna Bergman-Tabbert, DOE-GJO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fed. Biz Opps Magazine – 3/6/02 notice that DOE is open to ideas on how to clean up the Atlas site. No deadline. <p>5. DEQ Report on Atlas Employee Records Access (Bill Sinclair, UDEQ)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DRC report on this meeting has been provided the RC Board previously. <p>6. DOE "Next Steps" Discussion (DOE-GJO and UDEQ staff)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. NAS study timeline & opportunities for feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NAS study due to DOE in June, 2002. NAS will NOT recommend
------------------------------	--

	<p>a preferred alternative.</p> <p>b. DOE final remediation plan publication DOE-GJO to deliver draft final plan to HQ by 9/30/02.</p> <p>c. DOE data gaps GW model sensitivity testing River migration issue/mitigation Characterize tailings pile subsoils – rads & metals Study potential for erosion of pile by Moab Wash Review available geologic data for Klondike Flat Data to be obtained in Federal FY 2003 Upgradient GW wells (measure horizontal bedrock recharge) Evaluate human health and environmental risks for 3 different scenarios Refine cost estimates Finish Rad survey of site soils</p> <p>d. Possible projects for State escrow money Soil / geologic characterization at Klondike Flat (will wait on DOE evaluation of existing geologic data to decide) DWR aquatic habitat study of river sandbar areas</p> <p>e. Dust control for Spring, 2002 CaCl₂ applied to pile topslope area (should last 3 – 6 months) Water truck and driver on site 10 hr/day, 7 day/week</p> <p>7. Site Funding Needs Current Presidents budget not enough funding to do: Initiate Interim GW Action (pump & treat) Prepare required NEPA documents Complete rad survey of site soils</p> <p>8. Other Issues (general discussion)</p>
March 25, 2002	<p><u>Moab Millsite Stakeholder's Relocation Subcommittee Meeting - Moab, Utah</u></p> <p>1. Seven Klondike Flat Transportation Options Considered (5 = new)</p> <p>Mine truck haul on part of upcoming expansion of Hwy 191 UDOT opposed this option for several reasons, including 1) traffic congestion at Arches NP entrance [current traffic ~ 13,000 vehicles/day], 2) dust control, 3) traffic safety</p> <p>Mine truck haul on County Road with new road construction beyond 7-Mile wash to Klondike Flat. Similar problems as option above. Requires upgrade of County Road, new road construction N. of 7-Mile Wash, and construction of an overpass over Hwy 191 near Dalton Wells area.</p> <p>Combination conveyor haul and mine truck haul. Install conveyor system to area beyond road cut in Hwy 191 (S. end of County Road.</p>

	<p>Similar construction requirements as option above.</p> <p>Conveyor haul to Klondike Flat</p> <p>Semi-truck haul to Klondike Flat (already in DOE Plan) Requires on-site access ramp to be constructed at E. side of mill site. 1 truck / 2 minutes (current truck traffic ~ 3,900/day = 3/min)</p> <p>Railcar haul to Klondike Flat (already in DOE Plan)</p> <p>Slurry pipeline transport to Klondike Flat Requires wastewater holding/evaporation pond construction Need to dry tailings before placement in cell Cold season complications</p> <p>2. IUC White Mesa Transportation Option: Slurry Pipeline Need to dry tailings before placement Cold season complications Current IUC design calls for 1 FML (no leak detection system) On arrival, tailings = Title II (NRC license amendment required) Private ownership of disposal site allows project to capture cost savings on labor rate (avoid Davis-Bacon rates). San Juan County Commission want pipeline left in place after project to allow for inter-basin water diversion from Colorado River.</p> <p>Next Meeting: Wednesday, May 1 in Moab, 9am – 1pm, Grand County Council Room Tentative Agenda: DOE Presentation of Preliminary Ton-Mile Cost Estimates for County Road related options Semi-truck / Hwy 191 option Conveyor to Klondike Flat Other Presentations (to be invited) IUC discussion of general slurry transport concepts Authors of other alternatives – that have approached DOE-GJO</p>
April 16, 2002	<p><i>Moab Millsite Groundwater Subcommittee Meeting</i> April 16, 2002 8:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. DOE-GJO, Grand Junction, Colorado</p> <p>1. Review of DOE's Implementation Plan for Initial Remediation Action (Freshwater Application). (Note: this plan will be distributed to all Subcommittee members in the very near future.)</p> <p>2. Briefing by DOE on Interim Remediation Action (Groundwater Pump & Treat).</p>

	<p>3. Update from DOE on evaluation of long-term groundwater clean-up to achieve UMTRCA Groundwater Standards (including evaluation of Shepherd-Miller's assessment of long-term groundwater clean-up as a function of cap-in-place or relocation).</p> <p>4. Potential groundwater-related projects to be supported by Escrow Funds.</p>
--	---

VII. OTHER DEPARTMENT ISSUES

No items

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment presented at the meeting.

IX OTHER ISSUES:

a. Next Board Meeting - June 7, 2002, Department of Environmental Quality (Bldg #2), Conference Room 101, 168 North 1950 West, Salt Lake City, Utah 2:00 - 4:00 p.m.

The next Board meeting is scheduled for June 7, 2002, at the DEQ Building #2, Conference Room 101, at 168 North 1950 West, in Salt Lake City. The Board meeting is scheduled to start at 2:00 p.m. Bill Sinclair indicated that there would be a possible teleconference Board Meeting for the month of May 2002, instead of having a regular meeting. Bill said that the only thing he could see on the upcoming May agenda was the approval by the Board of some additional rules regarding the uranium mills and uranium mill tailings disposal facility requirements that needed to go to public comment. Bill asked the Board Members to look forward to some possible final arrangements this upcoming teleconference Board meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.